UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,447	01/27/2004	Christian Bertin	127523	8583

8968   7590   11/13/2008
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
ATTN: PATENT DOCKET DEPT.
191 N. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 3700
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER
IDOWU, OLUGBENGA O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2425	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/13/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 September 2008*.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/02/08

has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 9/2/2008 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Examiner's rejection for the case is based mainly on three references; Horowitz,

Shoff and Boyer. Horowitz teaches a system that allows a user to reserve a program for

recording. The system saves the recording information of the program and also has the

capability of requesting and receiving updates. Horowitz lacks some elements of the

application such as the reservation being made on a server and the recording

information including a link to server(s) for updating the recording information. Shoff is

brought in for the deficiency of the record file having a link to the update server and

Boyer is brought in for its teaching on a server based reservation.

In response to applicant's arguments on page 9, paragraph 4, the applicant is

correct by saying Horowitz does not teach the same recording method as the

application. The examiner has covered the limitation by bringing Boyer that teaches an online EPG. This online EPG is used to modify the EPG resident at the client device in Horowitz hence covering the limitation.

In response to the arguments on page 9, paragraph 5, Shoff teaches a system that has files that contain links to servers with more information on programs. Fig. 3 of Shoff also shows that each program is associated to a specific link.

In response to the arguments on page 11, paragraph 1, contrary to the argument being made by the applicant about the link being associated with the media content itself. Previous arguments made on page 10, particularly paragraph 3 point towards the links being associated to the programs on a per-show basis. Even with this, Shoff's system still teaches the link not being just for the media content itself but for the media content associated with a network such as Fox or NBC. Also, examiner disagrees with the applicant's analysis of the motivation. Examiner still stands by the fact that the burden is reduced by having a specific URL to go to as compared to a case when the system just has a keyword and has to conduct a few searches in order to find relevant websites.

In response to the arguments on page 11, paragraph 4, about Boyer not talking about recording. Horowitz already teaches the recording aspect of the application. Horowitz just does not teach the system with server based reservation. Boyer in brought in to modify Horowitz' user based EPG. Also, examiner disagrees with the arguments with regards to the motivation. Having the software at the Headend reduces cost in the

long run. Since the software will be all in one location, over time, the cost to upgrade

multiple devices will be greater than just upgrading in one location.

In response to applicant's arguments on page 12, concerning claim 6, Horowitz

teaches, in paragraphs 0034 - 0037, a loop that has values x and y that correspond to

the start time of a program. These values are used to check for updates and the checks

are done in loops with subsequent loops having x and y values closer to program start

time. Horowitz [0036] gives a description of the loop.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1 – 6, 13– 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Horowitz, publication number: US 2004/0078817 A1 in view of Shoff, patent

number: US 6240 555B1 in further view of Boyer, patent number: US 7 269 838 B1.

As per claims 1, 14-15 and 16, Horowitz teaches a method of recording audiovisual

contents, the contents being broadcast according to a schedule, the method

comprising:

Selecting, from an access terminal an audiovisual content to be recorded, the

content being associated with a broadcast data and time predetermined by a content

broadcaster (receiving a recording request, the request being associated with

information such as program title and time, [0018], lines 9 – 13, [0042], lines 9 – 15,

STB having web surfing capabilities that allow to access information over the Internet

[0062], lines 9 - 12) and

Supplying to the access terminal a record file of the selected audiovisual content

in response to the selection and the scheduled date and time for broadcasting it

(storing received recording request, [0027], lines 7 – 11, request contains date and

time, [0018], lines 11-13, [0042], lines 9 - 15),

generating a request to update the record file, the request being sent by the

terminal to the update server (updating based on requests form client device, [0051])

receiving by an access terminal the record file (receiving program information

from the program guide, [0018], lines 9 - 13)

generating by the access terminal a request to update the record file (update

request, [0018], lines 16 - 19), and

Horowitz does not teach wherein the record file further includes the address of an

update server, a step of the access terminal sending the request to the address

included in the record file.

In an analogous art, Shoff teaches wherein the record file further includes the address

of an update server, a step of the access terminal sending the request to the address

included in the record file (data fields corresponding to a program having link to server

that has additional information on the specific program which can be accessed on request, Col. 6, lines 8 – 26, Fig. 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Horowitz' conflict management system by including a link to server with additional information as described in Shoff's supplemental content system for the advantages of reducing the burden placed on processors for finding relevant information source.

The combination of Horowitz and Schoff do not teach wherein the selection is made on a presentation server.

In an analogous art, Boyer teaches wherein the selection is made on a presentation server (internet based EPG, col. 3, lines 1 - 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Horowitz and Schoff buy including a system that allows remote access to the program guide as described in Boyer's internet based EPG system for the advantages of reducing the cost of the system and providing a central location for accessing the EPG.

As per claim 2, the combination of Horowitz, Shoff and Boyer teach a method according to claim 1 of recording audiovisual contents broadcast according to a schedule, the method including a step of updating the record file in the event of modification of at least one of the date and time of the broadcast (Horowitz; updating record file, [0029]), or

cancellation of broadcasting a selected audiovisual content, or substitution of some other audiovisual content.

As per claim 3, the combination of Horowitz, Shoff and Boyer teach a method according to claim 1 of recording audiovisual contents broadcast according to a schedule, wherein the update request includes the address of the update server and the identification information of the audiovisual content (Horowitz; update information, [0051], lines 10 –17, Shoff: update link, Col. 6, lines 8 – 26, Fig. 3).

As per claim 4, the combination of Horowitz, Shoff and Boyer teach a method according to claim 1 of recording audiovisual contents broadcast according to a schedule, wherein the request is an HTTP request (Shoff: update link, Col. 6, lines 8 – 26, Fig. 3).

As per claim 5, the combination of Horowitz, Shoff and Boyer teach a method according to claim 1 of recording audiovisual contents broadcast according to a schedule, wherein the terminal sends the request to update the record file periodically up to the date and time scheduled for broadcasting the selected audiovisual content (Horowitz: regular updates, [0031], lines 7 - 15).

As per claim 6, the combination of Horowitz, Shoff and Boyer teach a method according to claim 1 of recording audiovisual contents broadcast according to a

schedule, wherein, during the selection step a single audiovisual content is selected,

and wherein the terminal sends the request to update the record file increasingly often

as the date and time for recording the selected audiovisual content approaches

(Horowitz: regular updates, [0031], lines 7 – 15, [0034 – 0037]).

As per claim 13, the combination of Horowitz, Shoff and Boyer teach a method

according to claim 1 of recording audiovisual contents broadcast according to a

schedule, wherein the request includes a reference of a user for statistical purposes

(updating based on requests, [0051], lines 5 - 7).

5.   Claims 7 - 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Horowitz, publication number: US 2004/0078817 A1 in view of Shoff, patent

number: US 6240 555B1 in view of Boyer, patent number: US 7 269 838 B1 in further

view of Carden, Patent number: US 6 996 627 B1.

As per claims 7 - 9, the combination of Horowitz, Shoff and Boyer teach updating a

record file based on changes in schedule.

The combination does not teach an identifier associated with an already recorded

content.

In an analogous art, Carden teaches recording audiovisual contents broadcast

according to a schedule, wherein the record file includes at least one field marked by a

markup language element and defining, for a given audiovisual content in the same file,

a content identifier associated with a content already recorded in the storage means of the access terminal (the program data structure 200 contains some of the program information items 102 as well as identifies the location of other program information items 102, col. 6, lines 19 - 22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combination of Horowitz, Shoff and Boyer by including a way to track previously recorded items, as described in Carden's information updating system, for the advantages of saving storage space by not recording already recorded programs.

As per claim 10, the combination of Horowitz, Shoff and Boyer teach updating a record file based on changes in schedule.

The combination does not teach an XML schema.

In an analogous art, Carden teaches recording audiovisual contents broadcast according to a schedule, wherein the syntax of files exchanged between the access terminal and the server is defined by an unique data structure schema, in particular an XML schema (XML, col. 4, lines 9 -14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combination of Horowitz, Shoff and Boyer by including the use of XML, as described in Carden's information updating system, for the advantages of representing data structures, records and lists.

6.   Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Horowitz, publication number: US 2004/0078817 A1 in view of Shoff, patent

number: US 6240 555B1 in view of Boyer, patent number: US 7 269 838 B1 in further

view of Yamato, Publication #: 2002/0127000A1.

As per claim 11, the combination of Horowitz, Shoff and Boyer teach, a method of

recording audiovisual contents broadcast according to a schedule (receiving a

recording request, the request being associated with information such as program title

and time, [0018], lines 9 – 13, [0042], lines 9 - 15),

a step of receiving a record request file from which the access terminal generates a

record-request request designed to be sent to a predetermined server for executing

automatically the selection step (VOD, [0050])

The combination does not teach a preliminary step of selecting a plurality of contents

having a common topic

In an analogous art, Yamato teaches the method including a preliminary step of

selecting a plurality of contents having a common topic, (In addition, the device 100

searches the data of the EPG for user's favorite programs by using keywords or types

which are established in advance by the user, [0169], lines 6 -10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the

combination of Horowitz, Shoff and Boyer by including the step of selecting contents

with a common topic, as described in Yamoto's recording device, for the advantages

of updating only files that are of interest to the user and avoiding the clogging of the

network by updating every available file.

As per claim 12, the combination of Horowitz, Shoff, Boyer and Yamato teach a

method according to claim 11 of recording audiovisual contents broadcast according to

a schedule, wherein the record request file includes the address of said predetermined

server for generating the record-request request (Shoff: update link, Col. 6, lines 8 –

26, Fig. 3).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to OLUGBENGA O. IDOWU whose telephone number is

(571)270-1450. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 7am -

5pm Est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Brian Pendelton can be reached on 571 272 7527. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Olugbenga O Idowu/
Examiner, Art Unit 2425

/Brian T. Pendleton/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2425